



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WATERS—APPROPRIATION FOR IRRIGATION—RIGHTS OF RIPARIAN OWNERS.—This action was first instituted by the plaintiff, Hough, and another to restrain defendant, Porter, from interfering with the flow of water in a creek to which the land of plaintiff, Hough, is riparian. Defendant, Porter, claimed his interference was of right, on the ground of prior appropriation. *Held*, the desert land act (U. S. Comp. St. 1901, p. 1548) abrogated the modified doctrine of riparian rights as to public lands entered since its enactment, and allows the person who first appropriates and diverts water for use in irrigation, manufacturing, or mining the better right to use the water for those purposes. *Hough et al. v. Porter et al.* (1909), — Ore. —, 98 Pac. 1083.

For a long time the far western states have discarded the riparian rights theory as inapplicable to western conditions. However, many of these states have hesitated to leap from the common law rule,—that every riparian owner is entitled to the natural flow, undiminished in quantity and without deterioration in quality, of the stream to which his land is riparian,—to the rule born of the necessities of the Californian miner,—that he who first appropriates, diverts, and puts the waters of a running stream to a reasonable use thus acquires the prior and exclusive right to such use. Oregon has been one of the states that has taken the middle ground and stood for the so-called modified doctrine of riparian rights. *Low v. Schaffer*, 24 Ore. 239; *Coffman v. Robbins*, 8 Ore. 278. The principal case, while based upon the acts of Congress of 1866 and 1877 (U. S. Comp. St. 1901, p. 1437 and p. 1548), and strictly applicable only to public lands acquired since 1877, shows that Congress has seen fit to overlook the doctrine of modified riparian rights and adopt the prior appropriation theory. The water rights of over fifty persons were involved in the principal case. Commissioner King in 95 Pac. 732, when the case first appeared before the supreme court, intimated that if the distribution of water in this instance had to be made under the modified riparian rights theory it would present a serious task. The two theories, that of riparian rights and that of prior appropriation, seem to be diametrically opposed. The principal case appears to be a step towards the adoption of the strict rule of prior appropriation.

WILLS—TESTAMENTARY CAPACITY—MONOMANIA.—For twenty or twenty-five years prior to his death testator was an enthusiastic follower of Swedenborg, spending much of his time and money in advocacy of Swedenborgian thought and the dissemination and distribution of the tracts and writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. The evidence showed that the Swedenborgian dogmas dominated the testator's mind and thought, intruded themselves into his business and social relations and for twenty years prior to his decease it was impossible for him to engage in conversation without intermingling the teachings and tenets of Swedenborg. He would accost people on the street, in the stores, at his office, and in his home, strangers and acquaintances alike, "young and old, those of high and lowly station," and urge upon them the acceptance of his views as long as he could get a hearing. He would call upon his own skilled employees during working hours, request them to suspend their work and give him a hearing for two or three